

to respond to the gentleman from Massachusetts on just a couple of points.

One, we had a number of discussions on zeros and what that means when we talk about the debt, nine zeros, 12 zero, six zeros, I would say there are a lot of American families that are concerned about five zeros and what the impact of the tax increase is going to have on that.

With all respect to my friend from Massachusetts, the Democrat budget does have the largest tax increase in American history. In order to make that budget balance, all of the tax relief which we have worked so hard to achieve in the last few years, and which is behind the growth and the economy, all that would go away, tax relief for married families, tax relief for every American worker who pays taxes. All that's erased in the Democrat's budget that is behind this spending bill that we are in today.

I think he helps me make the point that this is, when he talks about trillions of dollars, that this bill, that this amendment is a very modest step in curtailing that spending.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, if I may inquire as to the amount of time remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia has 11 minutes. The gentleman from Ohio has 20 minutes.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to my friend from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX).

Ms. FOXX. I want to thank my colleague from Georgia.

Mr. Chairman, this budget proposal isn't a real surprise; it's business as usual for the Democrats and proves that their promises to be fiscally responsible are just empty rhetoric. If this budget, along with the other budgets that we have been approving, are approved, it signals a return to the Democrats' beloved tax-and-spend model for government. They are very happy to try to run the lives of all Americans from the Federal level.

The 2001 and 2003 tax cuts have produced a real decrease in the tax burden on North Carolina's married couples, single parents, and families. Almost every taxpayer, low-income, married, single or self-employed, will lose valuable tax cuts under the assumptions made in the Democrat budget proposal earlier this year, and that would cover the costs that are in this budget tonight.

The economy is booming. The stock market is doing great. People's 401(k) plans are increasing tremendously. But they want to stop that because they want to spend your money. They think they know better how to spend your money than you know how to spend your money.

The Federal Government doesn't have a revenue problem. Revenues increased by 14.5 percent in 2005, 11.6 percent in 2006, and they are projected to grow by an additional \$167 billion, or 7

percent, this year, according to the latest OMB estimate.

Again, the economy is booming, things are going great, but the Democrats would put a halt on that with their profligate spending. To put it another way, the Federal Government is projected to collect \$800 billion more in revenue in 2007 than was just the case 4 years ago, \$2.6 trillion in 2007 compared to \$1.8 trillion in 2003.

□ 1930

We need to slow down spending and allow the American people to keep more of their money. They know how to spend it better than Federal bureaucrats do.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. OLIVER).

Mr. OLIVER. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

And I just want to say to the gentleman from North Carolina that the absolute platinum standard for fiscal irresponsibility lies squarely on the shoulders of her party and the Presidents of her party.

The national debt for this country when President Carter left office in 1981 was less than \$1 trillion. The national debt 12 years later, in the case of President Carter, that represents the debt that had been reached over 180 years of American history. Twelve years later, the national debt when the first President Bush left office was \$4.3 trillion, more than four times as much, more than quadrupling the total national debt. That is the gold standard of fiscal irresponsibility.

And then we had 8 years of President Clinton, and the national debt went up another \$1.2 trillion, about a 25 percent increase in the national debt in the 8 years that he was President.

But then, under the present President Bush and the Congress of his party in control during those years, the national debt has gone up \$3.3 trillion more, a total of about two-thirds more, 67 or 68 percent more in debt. That is the platinum standard in debt increase and in fiscal irresponsibility.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 1 minute to my friend from Texas, the chairman of the Republican Study Committee, Mr. HENSARLING.

Mr. HENSARLING. I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I must admit, every time I come to the floor and a Democrat lectures me on fiscal responsibility, I feel like I am having an Alice in Wonderland experience; and that is because the deficit is the symptom, it is spending that is the disease. And so we have Democrats come to the floor and say, well, when you Republicans were in power, you spent too much. Well, some of us Republicans agree. So what is your answer, Mr. Chairman? Well, they want to spend even more.

For the last 10 years, look at the record. Every time the Republicans offer one budget, the Democrats offer a

budget that spends even more. And then they say it is fiscally irresponsible that the national debt went up from \$5 trillion to \$8 trillion. I don't like that a bit. But, guess what? Because the Democrats' budget was stone cold silent on entitlement spending, the national debt unfunded obligations is \$50 trillion. So I will be glad to accept responsibility for \$3 trillion when my friends on the other side of the aisle accept responsibility for their \$50 trillion.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I continue to reserve my right to close.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am tempted to ask my good friend from Ohio whether it is the final right to close, or whether it is otherwise.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. I will continue to reserve my right to close, unless my chairman wants more time.

Mr. PRICE of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, at this time I am pleased to yield 5 minutes to my good friend from Arizona (Mr. SHADEGG).

Mr. SHADEGG. I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I like us being pleasant with each other.

I think this is a fascinating debate and an important debate, and, quite frankly, I have watched it unfold over the bills earlier this year. And the reality is, in Washington, nobody has the high ground on spending.

When I and my colleagues as fiscal conservatives get up on this side and say cut spending, as we are in this amendment by a mere 1 percent, it is absolutely fair and absolutely true for my colleagues to get up on the other side, as they have done and done well, and lecture us about spending. You guys are the, to use the words a moment ago, platinum standard on spending. And in many ways they are absolutely right.

I note with chagrin that because neither Republicans nor Democrats have the high ground on spending, something has to be done, and I would suggest at some point we have to begin. Maybe it is with this amendment, maybe it is not with this amendment, maybe it is with something else. But let's talk about spending.

On our watch, on the Republicans' watch, family income grew from 1995 to 2004 by 8.2 percent. Pretty good. Not bad. We could all wish it had been better. But what did Republicans do on spending? Republicans grew Federal outlays by a staggering 25 percent. You are right, we don't have much high ground to talk about. But when, then, will we start? And who will it be that starts?

Your side of the aisle encouraged the American people by saying, JAMES CLYBURN, Democratic House chairman, said in a press release on October 10, 2006: "Democrats offer a new direction which includes fiscal responsibility."

Speaker-elect NANCY PELOSI in a press release November 16 said: "We will work together to lead the House of Representatives with a commitment to integrity, to civility, which we have